

[Argument] Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some people believe that children should be taught by their **parents** about how to function as useful members of society, while others believe that sending children to **educational institutions** is the best way for them to study this. Although the latter opinion can be beneficial in some cases, I believe that family upbringing plays a more important role in educating children to be good parts of the community.

Schools can be considered suitable places for children to learn to be good citizens. With standardised educational methods, schools can foster children's cognitive development so that they are able to contribute to society in the future. For example, Trung Vuong school and Vinschool are well known for having nurtured successful alumni such as Professor Ngo Bao, Professor Nguyen Hung who have devoted their talents to the development of the country. However, these people only represent a small fraction of the total number of students attending schools, and thus sending children to schools cannot be the best method of educating them to be good members of society.

I **believe** that **parents** play a more important role in teaching them how to be good citizens. In Vietnam, the average class size is 20 students, which makes it difficult for educators to provide proper schooling for each student. One to one lessons at home, on the other hand, allow children to progress faster. Furthermore, parents form stronger bonds with their offspring and thus, it is easier for them to shape children's personalities at an early age. For example, by telling stories such as Robin Hood, Cinderella before bedtime, parents can instil a sense of compassion and integrity into them. These children are likely to become good members of society when they grow up.

In conclusion, although sending children to **schools** can be seen as a way of teaching them how to be good citizens, I believe that **domestic upbringing** has a bigger impact on determining who they are in the future.

[Argument] There is an increasing trend around the world of married couples deciding not to have children. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages for couples who decide to do this.

An increasing number of married couples around the world are choosing to remain childless. The main **benefits** of not having a child for couples are that they can focus on their careers and have more time for themselves. The main **drawbacks** are that they could not fit into their peers' group and have no one to look after them when they get old.

One primary **advantage** of remaining childless for married couples is that they can focus on their work. This is because they have less responsibility and distractions in their lives compared to the couples that have a child. Another advantage of this is that they have more spare time. Looking after a child is a full-time job for parents and takes most of their time, while child-free couples have lots of free time after work. For example, many couples stop going out late with their friends after having a child as they have to stay at home to look after their children.

One **disadvantage** of couples deciding not to have children is that they can struggle to hang with their peers after most of them have children. Most parents prefer to spend more time with other couples that have children as well. Moreover, not having anyone to look after them in their old age is another disadvantage. Children are the ones who take care of their parents when they get old because their parents did the same for them when they were young. For instance, the vast majority of the people who live in care homes have no children.

In conclusion, the main **benefits** of staying child-free for couples are that they can be more career-oriented and have more free time for themselves, and the main **drawbacks** are that they could have problems about fitting into their friends' group and having no one to take care of them when they become older.

[Issue] In many professional sports, there is an increase in the number of athletes using banned substances to improve their performance. What are the causes of the phenomenon and what are some of the possible solutions?

In many professional sports, it is becoming commonplace for athletes to abuse prohibited substances to boost their overall performance. This essay will discuss how stiff competition and lax testing systems are the main cause of this **problem**, and the most suitable **solutions** are imposing heavier punishments on violators and revamping testing facilities.

The main cause of this **problem** is the fierce competition that exists in any sport. In other words, many professional athletes feel that they have to take substances like steroids to give themselves an advantage over other strong opponents. Another reason is the lack of strictness in testing procedures. Many athletes who take advantage of banned substances can still get off scot-free due to the holes in testing systems. For example, a high-profile mix martial artist named Jon John who is notorious for using P.E.D. described how easy it was to get away with cheating in an interview in 2015.

A viable **solution** is to heavily punish lawbreakers. If sports clubs and establishments raise the fine for using banned substances, many athletes will think twice before making an attempt to cheat. Another way to deal with this issue is to upgrade testing amenities. This will eradicate any holes existing in the system and ensure that the test result is highly accurate. For instance, after the UFC had made major investments to provide their staff with the latest testing equipment, many fighters in their organisation got caught.

In conclusion, strong competition and ineffective testing systems are the main cause of this **problem**, and the most suitable **solutions** are enforcing harsher punishments on violators and reforming testing facilities.

[Argument] Details of politicians' private lives should not be published in newspapers. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is thought that the information regarding politicians' personal lives should not be shared in print media. This essay strongly agrees with this suggestion because **publishing** these details could be harmful to their families, and obtaining this type of information might require **breaking the law**.

First and foremost, what makes that the details related to private aspects of politicians' lives should not be **shared** in newspapers is that it could be harmful not only to these individuals but also to their families. This is because revealing some details from their personal lives could expose them to unwanted comments or allegations, which might lead to a great deal of distress. In Poland, for instance, in 2015, the vice-prime minister committed suicide due to not handling the pressure caused by the paparazzi invading his and his family's private life.

Furthermore, obtaining this type of information, in most cases, means **breaking the law**. This is because the right to privacy is one of the most fundamental policies in society, and anyone who wants to access the lives of politicians must obtain their consent. However, not only are paparazzi hired to invade properties belonging to politicians to take photos without their permission, but also politicians' colleagues and relatives are bribed to share confidential facts from their lives. For instance, an accident in which Princess Diana was killed was partly caused by the paparazzi who followed her car, trying to take photos of her and her boyfriend against their will.

In conclusion, I strongly support the suggestion that politicians' lives should not be subject to the interest of newspapers because **revealing** personal facts from politicians' lives could destroy their family life and the process of obtaining these details often requires **wrongdoing**.

[Argument] Some say that music, art and drama are as important as other school subjects, especially at the primary level. Do you agree or disagree?

Some people believe that arts-related subjects are as important as other school subjects, especially for primary school children. I totally agree with this statement because this can help children to **discover their talents** from an early age and can **increase their confidence**.

One of the reasons I agree that creative subjects have the same importance as other school courses in primary school is that it allows students to **find out their potential talents** early on. That is to say, school-age is the most convenient time for students to learn more about their interests by trying different activities as they are young enough to pursue their hobbies. They will probably not have any other chance later in their lives to discover that because they will be busy with difficult exams when they get older. For example, most famous singers were discovered by their music teachers at school from a young age, and they claimed that they could not be that successful if their teachers did not find out their talents when they were young.

Moreover, music, art and drama subjects help students to **boost their confidence**. That is because creative lessons teach students how to perform in front of lots of people and give them a chance to socialise with other students. As a result, students can realise their real potential and act more confidently. For instance, many psychologists suggest to students who are struggling with social anxiety to take drama lessons as it helps to enhance confidence.

In conclusion, this essay completely agrees that music, art and drama have the same value as other subjects in primary school because it allows children to **discover their hidden talents** early on and **increases their self-confidence**.

✓1 [Argument] Some people think that parents should teach their children how to be good members of society. Others, however, believe that school is the best place to learn this. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Some individuals believe that the right place to teach children how to become good citizens is the school, while others argue that parents should be the ones responsible for that. Although **parents** might influence their children more than anyone else, I believe that **educational institutions** are more trained and equipped to teach children how to become successful members of the community.

Parents influence their children more than anyone else. This is due to the fact that mothers and fathers are the ones who raise and spend most of the time with their children which dramatically influences the way children act and think. If parents act in a good manner, their children will indirectly imitate them. This fortifies the fact that no one might exert such a strong influence on their children. For example, a study in Britain showed that children are two times more influenced by their parents than their teachers. However, I believe that this is not enough and that school should be the place teaching children to become good people in society.

Schools are trained to build good citizens. Teachers spent their undergraduate years studying how to deal with children and train them to become better individuals in their communities. For this reason, educational institutions should be the place where children can safely acquire the needed behaviours to become better individuals in the future. For example, a recent study in the USA showed that 90% of schools train teachers how to help students to become better citizens. For this reason, **I believe** that the best place to do this is the school.

In conclusion, although **parents** have a strong influence on their children, I believe that the best place to create better citizens is the **school** because tutors are trained to do that.

✓ [Argument] Details of politicians' private lives should not be published in newspapers. To what extent do you agree or disagree?

It is argued that newspapers ought not to publish the details of private lives of politicians. This essay strongly disagrees with this view because politicians **build a public image** through such news and they could be **held accountable for any wrongdoings**.

On the one hand, politicians can gain public trust by **building a positive image** through newspapers. Being the focus of media, sometimes details of their personal interests end up on the front pages of newspapers, which allows them to gain popularity among masses, especially when their interests match with the general public. Recently, the pictures of a famous politician of Milan, while playing football with local school children were published in many newspapers, and he instantly became famous among school and college students. Hence, it helps them gain popularity by depicting themselves in a positive way.

On the other hand, publishing details of private affairs disclose the corruption of politicians and make them **accountable**. Many politicians usually hold a public office and are entrusted with managing public funds. If they do not spend the money on the wellbeing of people and are involved in corruption, newspapers expose their private life and put them under accountability. For example, when details of the lavish spending of the Mayor of London, while on a vacation, were revealed in the SUN, it prompted questions from many sections of the society, eventually exposing his corruption with the public money. Therefore, it is important that newspapers publish these details.

In conclusion, private matters of politicians should be published in newspapers because it allows them to **gain popularity** and expose their **corrupt affairs**.

✓ [Argument] Some say that music, art and drama are as important as other school subjects, especially at the primary level. Do you agree or disagree?

Some people believe that arts education is as significant as the study of other subjects, especially for primary students. I completely agree with this viewpoint because some **educational content could be better illustrated** in the forms of arts, and the study of arts is one key consideration which fosters **all-rounded growth** of young students.

The **arts could deliver information to students**, especially to those attending primary schools, **in a way that words in textbooks sometimes cannot**. Children may become bored and tired if they have to read or listen to too much educational content in textbooks. A colourful painting or a catchy song, on the other hand, can be much more appealing and thus more effective in conveying information to these children. For example, the Ghen Covy song has been taught at most schools in Vietnam and has become one of children's favourite songs. This song has effectively highlighted the importance of hand washing as a means of disease prevention, and has made it easier for many children to remember every step of hand sanitization for its catchy melody and appealing dancing moves.

Furthermore, the study of arts is one factor that contributes to a **comprehensive development** of young students. While academic subjects focus on children's cognitive development, arts education helps children to develop their social-emotional skills. By singing a song or drawing a picture, these children are likely to express their feelings and nurture their sense of community. For example, thousands of Vietnamese children, who were encouraged by their teaching staff, drew pictures of sunflowers to deliver messages of love and support for paediatric cancer patients.

In conclusion, the **arts can sometimes be better at transmitting knowledge** than textbooks, and the provision of both academic and arts education is necessary for an **all-rounded growth** of young students. I firmly believe that the study of arts should never be underestimated in any child educational institution.

[Argument] Some people think that all university students should study whatever they like. Others believe that they should only be allowed to study subjects that will be useful in the future, such as those related to science and technology. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

Some would argue that all students in universities have to study the subject they like, while others think that they have to only study something useful for their future, for example, those related to **science and technology** sectors. Although learning about the latter subjects is crucial to secure a good job and salary, I believe that enrollment in **whatever subject they favour** leads to students being successful in their fields.

Studying **science and technology** during third-level education makes students able to easily find a job that pays high wages. That is to say, working in the majority of modern workplaces requires up-to-date technological information aiming to improve the quality of work and to compete with others, and, in turn, those employees will earn good remuneration. For instance, many IT graduates from the University of Toronto were able to have high positions and good wages in many renowned business companies. However, I think that the passion for what students study is more important than how much their earnings are in the future.

It is very important for university students to study the **subjects they like** because this is the reason behind a successful career. That is because the love for this particular subject allows them to go beyond their limits, be creative, and be eager to improve, and, thus, they might be promoted. For instance, many well-known musicians decided to study music because they were passionate about it and this positive spirit helped them climb their professional ladder. Therefore, I support this school of thought because studying a favourite subject is more important.

To conclude, despite the fact that a course in **science and technology** can provide postgraduates with a good future career and enough income, in my view, studying **whatever they prefer** is better because this leads to success in their field.

[Issue] In some countries, younger people are neglecting their right to vote. What problems does this cause and what are some of the possible solutions?

It is argued that in certain nations youth are not using their right to vote. This would **hinder the political change**, and it would also result in policies made that are not beneficial for these young people. The most viable **solutions** would be to create awareness among the younger generation and promote them to participate in politics.

Not participating in elections would mean that it would be difficult to **change the government** which is necessary for some countries across the globe. This is because, in any functional democracy, the only way to change the ruling party is by casting votes in the electoral process. Furthermore, if young individuals forge their right to vote, it would result in policies made that do not benefit them. As a result, they would feel that the state is not addressing their concerns and end up leaving the country. For instance, every year thousands of young adults from developing countries immigrate to Europe and North America because they are unhappy with their government's performance.

One way to **tackle these issues** is to inform these people about the power of vote. Campaigns should be held in universities and colleges to educate youth about their political rights. Another solution is to promote these young people to come into politics. Doing this would ensure their representation and their voices being heard. For example, Nelson Mandela was a young political activist who successfully fought against racism and became the first black President of South Africa.

In conclusion, neglecting to vote by the young generation would **delay the necessary government change**, and laws made that are not in their favour. However, encouraging youth participation in politics and awareness campaigns can be possible **solutions** to tackle these problems.

[Argument] Some people say that the best way to improve public health is by increasing the number of sports facilities. Others, however, say that this would have little effect on public health and that other measures are required. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

It is argued that the sports facilities should be increased in number to improve citizens' health, while others claim that other initiatives are more essential to be conducted. While I support the idea that **installing more sports facilities** would help ordinary people to enhance their general health, I am more convinced that **other effective measures** should be taken.

On one hand, people's general health status could have been improved greatly via **exercising**. It is proven that working out increases the amount of oxygen to the brain, helping people be more agile, both physically & mentally. Therefore, lack of physical exercise or insufficient physical movements in one's working performance may impact one's productivity. For example, Hanoi citizens are reported to be healthier than they were because of the availability of exercise equipment right at the local parts. However, I believe that this measure just improves partially not whole of the public's health.

On the other hand, there is a **wide range of conducts** in order to prevent poor health conditions. Improving diet quality is one of the effective measures that should not be neglected. A good physical health is indeed contributed by many elements, and a full nutrient meal makes consumers stronger and highly resistant to some diseases. In Vietnam, there used to be a program of introducing milk into daily meals to deter malnutrition from children. After 2 years of conducting this campaign, the number of underweight children was minimised noticeably. Therefore, I completely advocate other solutions to implement to warrant the public's general health.

In conclusion, although launching more **sports facilities** would benefit the overall health of citizens, I think that this matter could better be addressed by **other methods**.

[Argument] Some people think that it is better to educate boys and girls in separate schools. Others, however, believe that boys and girls benefit more from attending mixed schools. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

A number of people argue that it is better for boys and girls to get an education from different schools, while others believe that it is more beneficial for children if they attend combined schools. Although studying in **separate schools** will help boys and girls to focus more on their studies, I believe learning from **co-educational institutions** will help them to become more social in society.

On the one hand, when boys and girls attend **separate schools**, they will spend more time focusing on their studies. This is because there will not be any opposite gender to be attracted to and to get involved in any affairs. The schooling hours will be fully utilised to learn something rather than being diverted from studies and spending time with the ones they might have an affair with in the school. For example, in Nepal, students from St. Mary's Girls School showed a better academic performance than the girls who completed their school years from a co-educational institution. However, I believe that children attending mixed school will learn to be more social in the future.

On the other hand, **co-education** is more beneficial for children because they will learn some social skills during their school years. This is to say that children of both genders will be allowed to have combined studies and will learn how to deal politely with a person of the opposite sex, an important skill which is highly accepted by society. For example, boys who finished their studies at co-educational schools showed more courtesy towards ladies by offering some help when required. For this reason, it is better for children to attend mixed schools as it helps them to learn essential social skills.

In conclusion, although educating children in **separate schools** will help them to focus on their studies, I believe that **co-education** is much better for girls and boys as they will learn essential social skills in school.

[Argument] Being a celebrity, such as a famous film star or sports personality, brings problems as well as benefits. Do you think that being a celebrity brings more benefits or more problems?

Lives of celebrities, like famous movie stars or sports people, bring benefits as well as problems. Although earning huge amounts of **money** is an advantage for celebrities, I believe the lack of **privacy** in their lives is a major problem that outweighs the benefit.

The main advantage for celebrities is that they receive a huge remuneration. That is to say, such people are paid large amounts of **money** for their efforts or performance. Celebrities usually decide how much they should be paid, and the people who pay them do not negotiate as they are confident in their star value. For example, Avengers star casts were paid in high amounts even before they read the script of the film series because of their previous performances in the older series. However, I think celebrities are also human beings and money cannot replace the happiness or freedom they need in their lives.

One of the downsides of being a celebrity is that it is not possible for them to lead a **private** life. This means that because of their fame and popularity, they are continuously followed by the media, and by their fans who eagerly wait to know what is happening in their favourite stars' lives. As such, celebrities lose their freedom and cannot enjoy their personal time with their families or friends. For instance, when Sachin Tendulkar became famous after his remarkable performance in cricket, he claimed that he could not walk down the streets of Mumbai as he used to do in the past. Thus, I believe celebrities cannot be carefree, and they always have to face the media in one or the other way.

To conclude, I think the problem of being a celebrity is that their **privacy** is interrupted, and this overshadows the benefit of making large amounts of **money** as a celebrity.

[Argument] Being a celebrity, such as a famous film star or sports personality, brings problems as well as benefits. Do you think that being a celebrity brings more benefits or more problems?

Being a famous person, such as a movie star or sports athlete, has many disadvantages and advantages. Although famous people will earn more **money**, I believe that there are more drawbacks because famous people will **not be safe in public places**.

The biggest advantage is that well-known individuals will earn loads of **money**. This is because they will get colossal amounts of money from their sponsors for promoting their products, such as mobile phones, laptops or cars. As a result, notable individuals will become affluent around the nation. Floyd Mayweather, for instance, is a famous boxer as well as a wealthy person in the United States of America. Each year he gets around millions of dollars from Burger Kings and Rolls Royce sponsors for promoting their products during boxing matches. However, I believe that famous celebrities face huge problems whenever they go out because their frenzied fans will annoy them.

The major drawback is that famous individuals' lives will be in **danger in public places**. This is because their foes will try to harm them whenever they go out either alone or with their family members, such as in parks or malls. As a result, they will have to hire some security guards to protect themselves against vicious-minded individuals. Jennifer Lopez, for instance, always goes out with five bodyguards. The reason is that in the past, some deranged fans attacked her in New York park and broke her left arm. Therefore, I believe that celebrities always face difficulties in common places because someone will assault them.

In conclusion, although well-known individuals earn big amounts of **money** from sponsors, notable people's lives will be in danger because **evil-minded people will harm them**. For these reasons, I believe that drawbacks are more than benefits.

[Argument] Some people say that television is useful for education, while others say it is useful only for entertainment. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

Television is considered useful for education by some, while others claim that it only serves entertainment purposes. While certain people believe television is only for **entertainment** as it steals time, this essay claims that it is valuable as **educational programs** on television can help a child's intellect.

Some believe television is only useful for **entertainment** since it takes away time. This is because they feel that children who spend too much time in front of the television may miss out on life's opportunities and that it is much more productive to spend time with friends, to work on homework, to go outside, or to relax instead of watching television. For example, kids who watch too much television tend to work less on their homework, which results in poor performance in school. However, I would argue that television is important as education programs can aid in boosting children's intellect.

Educational programs on television can help children become more intelligent. Kids who watch informative and educational shows learn to solve problems and develop strong mental maths skills. For instance, several studies have shown that kids are more likely to outperform their peers on tests when they watch educational shows. Additionally, studies have shown that children who watch cartoons most of the time score less than those who watch educational shows. Therefore, I strongly believe educational shows on television encourage intellectual development in children.

In conclusion, while television is seen as only useful for **entertainment** because it eats up time, watching informative **educational shows** on television can develop a child's intellectual skills.

[Issue] Multinational companies are becoming increasingly common in developing countries. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this?

It is becoming more popular in developing nations to see multinational corporations. There are some **benefits** for this trend such as the progress in the economy they create in these countries and the availability of jobs, however, the shut down of some small local businesses and the lower selling rate of local products can be its **drawbacks**.

The main **advantage** of the increasing number of these types of companies is the economic progress. That is to say, if multinational organisations operate in less-developed nations, this can bring wealth which boosts industries, trade, and other aspects of the economy. Moreover, more jobs will be available for the local people. That is because more workers and managers are needed to work for these companies which can be a good opportunity for locals to find a job. For instance, after opening a branch of Apple in Dubai, many local graduates were thrilled by the good news of being accepted to work under this renowned company.

However, one of the main **disadvantages** of this trend is the drop in the selling rate of the local products. That is because of the good reputations and qualities of international items, and, thus, citizens might refrain from buying their local products. Another disadvantage is that some small local shops could be closed. That is due to the unfair competition with these huge strong establishments, and as a result, some might be shut down or go bankrupt. For example, many amateur Syrian entrepreneurs, and after the harsh competition they had with international textile corporations, were forced to close their fabric factories.

In conclusion, although the **advantages** of the popularity of multinational organisations in developing countries are the economic progress and the improvement in the job market, nonetheless, its **downsides** are the drop in the average selling of local products and the closure of some small businesses.

[Issue] In many countries, the government prioritises economic growth above all other concerns. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this.

Economic growth is a sphere that receives more attention than any other national domain in many countries all over the world. The principal **benefits** of this phenomenon are lower unemployment and wealthier citizens, and the main **downsides** are higher costs of living for most and insufficient support for the poorest.

On one hand, what makes prioritising economic expansion **beneficial** for the public is the fact that fewer residents remain unemployed. This is because governments boost establishing various businesses, which will require many workers to operate. In addition, not only does a country become more powerful economically, but also many residents have an opportunity to become affluent. When companies generate more profit, it reflects how much money employees can make. In Poland, for example, 30 years after communism collapsed, average salaries offered for a middle-management position have tripled.

On the other hand, as a country's economy thrives, costs of living increase. The most compelling reason for that could be the fact that since workers are paid more, their services become more expensive, which results in higher prices of many products. Moreover, in many cases, a country whose main priority is its economy offers little support for those who need it. If authorities believe that a strong economy is of the greatest importance, they are rather reluctant to offer help to those who do not contribute to the nation's prosperity. To illustrate, when Donald Trump, who was a big advocate of a strong economy, became the president of the USA, the funds for jobless migrants were caught.

In conclusion, as with anything in life, prioritising economic growth by authorities has its **pros** and **cons**. While more have jobs that allow them to become wealthy, costs of living are going up, and those who need to rely on the social care system are marginalised.

[Issue] In some countries, even though the rates of serious crimes are decreasing, people feel less safe than ever before. What do you think are the causes of this problem and what measures could be taken to solve it?

Although grievous offences are reducing, some people feel more insecure than they used to. The **main reason** behind this is the increase of cyber bullying and hate-crimes, and the **solution** would be to raise the general awareness among the masses and by promulgating new laws.

The **primary cause** of people not feeling safer than they used to is because the arena of crime has changed. More people are interacting virtually over the internet, which is mostly unregulated. Therefore, people are easily subject to harassment and bullying on social media. Moreover, people are also subject to hate-crimes which is a consequence of constant portrayal of a certain group of people as evil by the media. For example, labelling the activities of criminals, who profess the Islamic faith, as terrorists has resulted in an increase in hate-crimes against Muslims across America.

The **solution** to such problems would be in educating the general people so that they are more aware. This will allow them to act more responsibly. Also, the government can play their part by enacting new laws that address the needs of time. This will make their citizens feel more secure because they can have their problems redressed. For instance, the government of Bangladesh recently enacted Digital Security Act, 2018 and Digital Security Rules, 2020 in order to penalise offences that take place in cyberspace, as crimes like online harassment and cyberbullying were not previously defined as an offence.

In conclusion, insecurity among some sections of the population is still prevailing due to the change in the nature of crimes that are being committed nowadays. However, this can easily be **addressed** by making people aware and also by making new laws.

[Argument] Most high-level positions in companies are filled by men even though the workforce in many developed countries is more than 50 per cent female. Companies should be required to allocate a certain percentage of these positions to women. To what extent do you agree?

Although women account for more than 50 per cent of the workforce in developed nations, a number of managerial positions are still occupied by men. Some believe that a certain proportion of these vacancies should be allocated to females. This essay, however, strongly disagrees with this statement because this can discourage qualified men to work hard, and such a policy can encourage organisations to find some wrong ways to outsmart the system.

Reserving a certain proportion of high-level positions for women might create problems because their gender may prevent educated males from making a contribution to the progress of a company. This is because any employee naturally wants to have equal opportunities for promotion irrespective of gender. If males at the workplace are deprived of it, they are not motivated to work hard. For example, psychologists claim that the motivation and hard work of subordinates directly hinge on the promotional system of a company.

Furthermore, imposing a quota will make companies seek for some illegal ways to outwit this regulation since the priority of most companies is to reward employees with high-level positions according to their knowledge and experience, not their genders. Hence, if any law contradicts the policy of a company based on gender, the owners of that company are more likely to make modifications to outsmart the system, which benefits neither of them. For example, not to compulsively hire female employees to the top management of a company, owners can change the title of a position to just to fill a vacancy.

In conclusion, I strongly disagree with the idea of allocation of certain high-level posts for females because of their gender since this can discourage qualified males to work hard and make companies find alternative ways to outwit the law.

[Argument] Some people think that the teenage years are the happiest time of most people's lives. Others think that adult life brings more happiness, in spite of greater responsibility. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is argued that adolescence years are the happiest years in one's life, while others believe that adulthood is the most joyful phase to live despite having bigger responsibilities. This essay believes that, although adolescents are free of responsibilities, adults enjoy their life more because they are free to make their own choices.

On one hand, adolescents are thought to live the happiest moments of their life because they are not asked to be responsible. Basically, a teenager lives with his parents, who not only provide him shelter, food, and education, but also, in some cases, would try to fulfil his fantasies. For instance, in my country, teenagers make a great example of spoiled people who spend their money carelessly and always ask for more, though they do not seem to be happy. However, I believe that not being obliged to worry about any responsibility is not what happiness is all about, and consequently adolescents do not live their happiest days.

On the other hand, others see that adulthood is a happier phase because adults are free to make the choices that fit their aspirations. Having the freedom of choice will eventually be followed by achievements and a sense of self-accomplishment, which is a primary source of joy. For example, many adults in my country are happy because of the choice of career or commitment they took on their own, and they see themselves happier than when they were teenagers. Therefore, I believe adulthood is the most enjoyable time because one cannot be happy if they have to follow others' plans even if it comes with no responsibilities.

In conclusion, despite having no responsibilities on their shoulders, adolescents do not live the happiest moments of their life. This essay believes that it is adulthood which is the most enjoyable in light of the fact that adults are free to make their own choices.

[Argument] In some countries, it is becoming increasingly common for people to follow a vegetarian diet. Do the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages?

In a number of countries, following a vegetarian diet has become very popular. Although being a vegetarian can limit the options when eating, I believe the **advantages** outweigh the **disadvantages** because it allows the body to work properly.

For vegetarian people, it is **difficult to find varied options to eat**. Since the majority of the worldwide population have a diet that includes animal products, this type of food is the one that is normally available at food businesses. Therefore, people with a vegetarian diet have to choose between a limited number of plates or products when buying food or eating out. For example, in many popular restaurants in Colombia, the menu has only a short vegetarian section which includes only two or three plates that are completely vegetarian. However, I believe that those options that are offered are healthier than plates that are sold in large quantities.

Following a vegetarian diet **allows the body to work better**. This is because science has shown that when our digestive system digests animal products, such as meat, it has to work harder to process the food that it is not designed to receive. Thus, people that have a diet based on plants and seeds are more prone to have a healthier life because they allow their bodies to focus their energy in its normal processes. For instance, people who become vegetarian are less prone to get sick because their immune system has all the energy focused on fighting bacteria and not causing chronic inflammation because of the food. That is why I consider that following a vegetarian diet can have more benefits in the long term.

In conclusion, although vegetarian people have **fewer options when buying products** without animal ingredients, it is my belief that following a vegetarian diet has a **positive impact on body functions**.

[Issue] In modern times, children are spending less time with their families and more time with their friends. Why has this change occurred? Do you think parents should force their children to spend more time at home?

Nowadays, children spend more time with their friends than with their families. This change has occurred because children **do not want to feel left out amongst their peers** and parents should not force children to stay home because **they will resent their parents for it**.

Young ones **do not want to miss out on social activities with their friends**. Since the invention of technology, many activities that people carry out, especially teenagers, are now being posted online. As a result, children want to engage more in activities with their peers so they would also have fun stories to post on their social media pages and not be the odd one among their peers. For example, many young people in South Korea are known to shop and visit fun places with their friends rather than their parents, so as to show off the fun activities they engage in on Wechat, a popular social media platform.

Children whose parents mandate spending more time at home might **hold a grudge towards their parents**. This is because if children are forced by their parents to spend more time at home, they may interpret this as a form of punishment and develop a negative attitude towards their parents, which defeats the goal of family time. However, if they are encouraged to play with their siblings and bond with the family, children will be more willing to stay at home. For example, most children in Nigeria, even though they spend time with their friends, look forward to family time because parents in Nigeria emphasise the benefits of spending more time with family.

In conclusion, children want to engage in activities with their friends and **not be left out**, and parents should **encourage their children to stay at home more, rather than force them** so that their children will not resent them.

[Argument] Some people think that the teenage years are the happiest time of most people's lives. Others think that adult life brings more happiness, in spite of greater responsibility. Discuss both views and give your own opinion.

It is believed by some that adolescent years are the happiest period of most people's lives, while others believe that adulthood brings more content, despite having more responsibilities. Although teenagers obtain new experiences in their teenage years, I believe that adults can enjoy the things they have accomplished.

On one hand, experiences that adolescents gain before they reach adulthood make them happy. This is because many teenagers get more freedom to do the things that they like without being controlled by their parents. A sense of freedom gives them the opportunity to socialise with their contemporaries and many of them fall in love for the first time. These are unprecedented experiences that make them feel very happy. For example, many dwellers of Sarajevo have said that teenage years were the happiest years of their lives. However, I think that adolescents do not know what real happiness is at such a young age.

On the other hand, adults can appreciate the things they have achieved. This is to say that many adults set goals when they were younger, such as having prosperous careers, because they knew achieving their goals would make them content. They worked hard to get closer to their goals, and when they finally achieved their targets, they felt contentment. For instance, many Bosnians dreamed about owning a property, and after purchasing housing they were ecstatic. Therefore, I believe that adults can value happiness at a greater level.

In conclusion, although pre-adulthood brings new experiences, I believe that adults enjoy the perks of their hard work.

[Argument] It is generally believed that some people are born with certain talents, for instance for sport or music, and others are not. However, it is sometimes claimed that any child can be taught to become a good sports person or musician. Discuss both these views and give your own opinion.

While some think that people can't succeed in sports or music unless they have some natural talents that a few people have, others reckon that any child can be educated to become successful in those areas. This essay agrees with the former view because, although children are able to get access to many professional training programs, natural gifts enable owners to excel at their subjects such as music or sports.

Some argue that all children can become good at music and sports as soon as they receive the appropriate learning programs. This is because now children are taught by many professional teachers, and the programs that they are involved in are far more modern and systematic. Therefore, they do not need talents to become successful. For instance, many renowned musicians and sports athletes in Vietnam admit that they are not talented, but they can thrive in their areas mainly because of their hard work of many years and the intensive training programs that their tutors gave them. However, I think that some subjects like music or sports have some unique features that are difficult for learners to master them.

Gifted people can thrive because their natural gifts help them quickly master knowledge. The immense level of their innate skills enables them to completely grasp anything they learn in a short amount of time, and they can creatively and successfully put them into practice. Let's take Mozart as a musical genius of all ages, with an extraordinary memory, he could remember any details of music like melodies and lyrics and composed thousands of famous musics of all time. For this reason, I believe that some inborn qualities play a crucial part for people to thrive in some areas like music or sports.

In conclusion, despite any professional programs that schools now offer, this essay thinks that children need to have some talents to become professional athletes or skilled musicians.

[Issue] Nowadays more and more people have to compete with young people for the same jobs. What problems does this cause? What are some possible solutions?

These days the competition for the same job has increased, as more young people apply for it. The **main problems** this causes are high competition for one job and an increased unemployment rate. The **most viable solutions** are creating special programs for young people and expanding the job market by introducing special positions for others.

Having a high number of people applying for the same job creates high competition for one position among younger and older people. As a result, for 1 position, hundreds of people apply, and only one, mainly young people, is hired. Additionally, this leads to unemployment, as there are not many positions available to people and not everyone finds a job. In Ukraine, for example, every year many people in their 40s or 50s file for unemployment insurance, as they were not able to find a job due to the companies hiring younger candidates rather than them.

One way for governments to overcome this difficulty is to create special positions for the elderly and senior people, like to be trainers. In such a way, they will not lose their jobs and will be able to pass down their knowledge to the younger generations. Another solution for organisations is to introduce more internships. Creating such opportunities will assist people in having at least temporary jobs. For example, every year a well-known Ukrainian mobile company "Life" hires the younger for one year program with a future potential of full-time employment, as they want to retain their current employees and provide future job opportunities for younger generations.

In conclusion, having **more young people applying for the same job creates high competition and unemployment**. In order to overcome this, the government should **introduce more positions, like trainers, for elderly and current employees, and offer more internships for the younger generation**.

[Argument/Issue] Nowadays, the way many people interact with each other has changed because of technology. In what ways has technology affected the types of relationships people make? Is this a positive or negative development?

Because of developments in technology, the way we communicate with each other has changed. As a result of this, **people are making friends** and even started to find themselves a partner through the internet. I believe that it is a negative trend because **people try to take advantage of us after they know about our personal life**.

Many have started making friends and dating online. Social media users follow individuals whom they don't know and interact with them either by commenting on their posts or texting to each other from these platforms. Some teenagers and even adults use dating websites to find themselves a partner. In such platforms, the internet normally pairs them up with a random person and they make conversation with each other. For example, the dating website called Omegle is getting popular among individuals.

People often get threatened by their online friends. The reason is that after they earn their friend's trust, and get familiar with their personal life, they start demanding money, and if a person refuses to give them what they want, they begin threatening them by telling them that they will hurt their loved ones. For instance, more than thousands of social media users in Uzbekistan are becoming the victims of such crimes every year.

In conclusion, as a result of improvements in technology, the way we interact with each other has changed. Because of this, **people are dating and making friends online**. I am of the opinion that it is a negative development because **people often get threatened by their online friends**.

[Issue] Today people are travelling more than ever before. Why is this the case? What are the benefits of travelling for the traveller?

People are travelling more than ever before in recent times. Achieving quality education from abroad is the main reason for this, and the major benefits of travelling for the traveller are that they will be entertained by watching exciting things around them and personality development.

The main reason for people travelling more today is to achieve quality education from abroad. This is because degrees from their own countries may not have more value. Instead, if they have degrees from abroad, people can compete with other individuals for amazing jobs, and by having such jobs, people's standard of living improves. For example, many engineers in India are travelling abroad in order to complete their higher education and by achieving quality education from abroad, they can get a phenomenal job anywhere across the world.

One benefit of travelling for the traveller is that they are amused by watching exciting things while travelling. This is because, usually people at home have a hectic lifestyle and they do their normal routine work. While travelling, travellers observe mesmerising lights and new things on their way and get entertained. Moreover, travelling helps in personality development of a traveller. This is because, in an airplane, they have to wait for a long time for their destination to come, which develops the quality of patience in travellers. For example, while travelling from Melbourne to Hyderabad, travellers have to wait for 16 hours in an airplane which develops patience and overall personality development in them.

In conclusion, today people are travelling more than ever before, to achieve quality education from abroad is the main reason for travelling, and the main benefits of travelling for the traveller are getting entertained by watching exciting things while travelling and personality development.

[Issue] Many people are now opting to provide technology companies with their personal data in exchange for access to software. Do the advantages of this outweigh the disadvantages?

These days, many individuals are choosing to give tech companies their personal information to gain access to software. Although using this software makes people's life easier, I believe that the benefits do not outweigh the drawbacks because companies are able to constantly influence consumers' choices.

The main advantage of sharing your private data with tech companies is that the software they provide you makes your life simpler. This is because this software offers users personalised help in their daily matters so that they can avoid wasting time and energy doing things that they can easily do with the aid of technology. For example, Google Drive offers you a free cloud-based storage where all your documents and pictures are automatically saved and you can access them from any device at any time, without worrying about saving them on a pen drive that you might lose. However, I believe that this argument is weaker because people should prioritise their privacy.

One of the disadvantages is that once they have access to your data, tech corporations can use them to control your choices at all times. This is to say that tech companies harvest the data you agreed to share with them, and through an in-depth analysis performed by artificial intelligence and through complex algorithms, they create profiles based on your interests, likes, and dislikes. These profiles are then sold to third-party companies for advertising purposes. For example, Google records all your google searches and all the videos you watch on YouTube and then decides what type of advertisement you would be more susceptible to. This targeted marketing has proven extremely successful. I believe this argument is stronger because people are deceived by these companies to generate revenues.

In conclusion, although providing confidential information to tech firms in order to use their software simplifies your life, I believe that being continuously influenced by their targeted marketing is a major drawback. For these reasons, I think that the negatives far outweigh the positives.

[Argument] Some people prefer to live in a house, while others feel that there are more advantages to living in an apartment. Are there more advantages than disadvantages of living in a house compared with living in an apartment?

Some people feel that it is better to live in a house, while it is the view of others that living in an apartment is more advantageous. Although it is more expensive to live in a house, I believe that there are more advantages than disadvantages of living in a house because houses are bigger in size.

Living in a house is less cost-effective in comparison to living in an apartment. This is because houses are usually bigger in size and offer more privacy to its inhabitants, as a result, the cost of owning or renting and maintaining a house is usually higher than for an apartment. For example, in Nigeria, people who live in houses spend on average three times more money than those who live in apartments because of the higher cost of mortgages and maintenance, such as utility bills, involved in living in houses. However, I believe that with appropriate planning and financial discipline, this extra expense can easily be paid off.

An advantage of living in a house is that houses are more spacious. Houses are usually built to be more accommodating than apartments, and this is an important factor to consider, especially for large families who require playgrounds and gardens for their children. To illustrate, in Nairobi, the average size of a house measures around 700 square metres, which is large enough to accommodate a private car park, a garden and children's playground, as compared to an apartment, which does not have enough space for these amenities. Therefore, I believe that there are more advantages than there are disadvantages of residing in a house than in an apartment.

In conclusion, even though it costs more to live in houses than in apartments, I believe that there are more benefits than drawbacks to living in a house because houses are more accommodating.

[Issue] In recent years, there has been a rise in the popularity of 2nd-hand clothing amongst the younger generation. Why is this happening? Do you think it's a positive or negative development?

In recent years, buying used clothes has become popular among youngsters. This is because many adolescents try to be like famous people, and I think it is a positive development because teenagers can save money for other useful things.

Many adolescents buy used clothes because they want to be like famous people. That is to say that they need different outfits for any occasion and that is expensive. That is because they cannot cope with the financial burden of buying new clothes from stores, such as Prada or Gucci. As a result, many youngsters buy second-hand clothes. For example, in the United States, many teenagers buy used Gucci products in order to wear them and be like their idols.

I think it is a positive development because teenagers who buy used shirts or pants can save money for other useful things, such as a computer or a car. That is to say that, if these adolescents have a computer, they could use it for school or even to work in computer related jobs. For example, many teenagers can work as a freelancer in many jobs that do not require high skills to do it, such as making presentations or translating works from other languages and as a result earn money and save it.

In conclusion, many adolescents are buying used clothes because they want to be like their idols, and I think it is a positive development because they can use the money they do not spend on useful things.

[Issue] Some companies have uniforms for their staff which must be worn at all times. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of this.

Some organisations force their employees to wear uniforms whenever they are at work. The **advantages** of this approach are creating a sense of discipline and displaying their professionalism. The **disadvantages** are that it may hurt employees' confidence and cause them to feel stressed.

One **benefit** of this measure is that it would result in them being more disciplined. Every time they put on that suit or dress, they would be reminded that they are working as part of the company and that they have a job to take care of, making them more responsible. Moreover, these employees will come across as more professional when they meet clients. This is because uniforms are often designed to be more suitable for business than casual clothes. For example, how appropriate staff members' outfits are is often cited by clients as one of the reasons they choose to do or not do business with a company.

One **drawback** of this policy is that it tends to make each individual feel less confident. This is because they all have their own styles of fashion, so they may feel uncomfortable putting on something that had been chosen for them. This is compounded by the fact that they must wear these outfits daily, which can be highly stressful. In other words, it is terribly frustrating having to wear the same thing for a long period of time. For instance, many major companies in Vietnam have a scheme to change the design of their uniforms every 6 months to slightly reduce the frustration caused by wearing the same outfit repeatedly.

In conclusion, while having a dress code can **instil a sense of discipline in the workforce and make them appear more professional in the eyes of customers**, this may also come with a **drop in employees' self-esteem and an increase in their levels of frustration**.

[Argument/Issue] Nowadays, the way many people interact with each other has changed because of technology. In what ways has technology affected the types of relationships people make? Is this a positive or negative development?

In recent years, advancements in technology have changed how people connect with each other. This has turned people into making much more friends but has also reduced the depth of those relationships. In my opinion, this is a harmful change due to the fact that it makes humans less able to communicate their personal feelings.

Technology's influence has enabled people to make much more friends than they possibly could in the past. This is largely owing to social media, which revolutionises communication and helps people to keep touch with each other regardless of their geographical locations. Another change in human relationships caused by modern technology is that the number of intimate relationships made has been substantially less significant. With so many people to care about, social media deters users from strengthening bonds. For instance, a stark difference can be observed in Vietnam, where most young adults 20 years ago – when the internet was underdeveloped, had much deeper connections than their modern counterparts.

The changes made to the types of relationships people make nowadays is largely a disadvantageous one, for it deters people from having deep connections. Lacking valuable bonds means that they have almost no one to confide in during depressive episodes that are inevitable for most humans, and thereby increase the possibility of making unwise decisions. Examples of this can be found all over the world, where the cases of depression that cause suicidal behaviors are becoming more and more common, and one of the primary contributing factors is victims having no one to share their burdens with.

In conclusion, despite having much more ability to connect, people are making less meaningful relationships; thus, the quality of relationships diminishes and harms their wellbeing.